

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action, Claims 1- 25 were rejected.

With this Amendment, Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 14-17, 20, and 22 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1-25 are at issue.

I. Objection To The Specification

The Examiner indicated that the specification statement “the data packet thus reaches the terminal 3 routing through an optimal path” found on page 27, lines 5-6, lacks a supporting description. Applicant respectfully disagrees and remarks that a substantially descriptive and supportive discussion details the operation of the routing communication of the packet data between the terminal 1 and the terminal 3. The IP V6 address selected by the terminal 3, the current network prefix of the terminal 1 and the terminal identifier of the terminal 1 serve to optimally route the data packet between the terminals 1 and 3 (See pages 25-26 of the specification).

Applicant has amended the specification on page 34, line 11, by removing the word “not” as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant has appropriately corrected the specification on page 36, lines 19-24, by including a reference to step S43 disclosed in FIG. 10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

II. Objection To The Claims

Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

In regard to Claim 2, the limitations cited by the Examiner as being contradictory to the description relate in fact to different aspects of the invention. That is, the statement “the fourth position information of said information processing apparatus” corresponds to the first through fourth aspects of the invention, and the statement “the fourth position information representing

the current position of the partner information processing apparatus” corresponds to the fifth aspect of the invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-9, 11-21 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ishiyama. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submit that the Examiner has misunderstood Ishiyama.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus connected to another information processing apparatus.

Claim 1 recites that “a storage unit for storing first position information representing an initial position of said information processing apparatus, and second position information representing an initial position of said another information processing apparatus when communication is established with said another information processing apparatus.”

The Examiner states that Ishiyama discloses a communication between a local mobile (information processing apparatus) and a remote mobile (another information processing apparatus), and indicates that when the communication between these apparatuses is established, the local mobile will receive from the remote mobile a message #2 of FIG. 7 containing COA1 (Care of Address 1), the initial position of “another information processing apparatus.”

However, in Ishiyama COA1 corresponds to the initial care of address (position) of the information processing apparatus (local mobile or mobile computer 2 or MN2) when positioned in Network 1, and COA2 corresponds to the care of address of MN2 when visiting Network 2 (See FIG.6). In Ishiyama, FIG. 7 illustrates that in message #2, MN2 communicates that the source of the message is “COA1” and that the destination is a correspondent host having CN (correspondent node) as its address. Subsequently to MN2 moving to Network 2, MN2 communicates to CN in message #6 a new care of address COA2. That is, COA2 corresponds to another position of MN2 rather than the initial position of another information processing apparatus.

Thus, Ishiyama fails to teach or suggest a second position information representing an initial position of another information processing apparatus.

Moreover, Claim 1 recites that “a receiver unit for receiving data from said another information processing apparatus, an acquisition unit for acquiring third position information representing a current position of said information processing apparatus, a first determining unit for determining whether the third position information acquired by said acquisition unit corresponds to the first position information stored in said storage unit, and an authenticator unit for authenticating the data received by said receiver unit, based on a result of determination provided by said first determining unit.”

Thus, as claimed the authentication of the received data is performed based on the determination that the third position information corresponds to the stored first position information. That is, even when the information processing apparatus acquires a current position (new IP address) that is different from the initial position (initial IP address), the authentication is still performed based on the initial IP address of the information processing apparatus.

In contrast, in Ishiyama when mobile computer 2 moves to other networks, an SA gateway update (request for changing the security association to the correspondent) is performed. That is, the mobile computer 2 searches through the security association database (SAD) to find those which have the destination (dst) address different from the current address, and issues a request to change the previous COA used as the destination in the security association into the current COA, with respect to every such address. Thus, an update request message of the security association is transmitted to all other communication terminals, such as CN 3 of FIG. 6 which registered as a communication object from the mobile computer 2.

As such, the IP address of the mobile computer 2 that is included in the security association is updated in all other communication terminals (see column 12, line 31 to column 13, line 5). Thus, the authentication packet that is generated based on the updated security association is transmitted to other networks. As a result, the authentication process is not performed using the initial IP address, but is based on information that indicates the current position of the mobile computer 2.

Thus, Ishiyama fails to teach or suggest that the authentication is performed based on the initial IP address of the information processing apparatus regardless of the network position of the information processing apparatus.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Ishiyama, as are dependent Claims 2–9.

Independent Claims 11–14, and 23–25 recite analogous distinguishing limitations as that of Claim 1 discussed above. Thus, Claims 11–14, and 23–25 are also allowable over Ishiyama, as are their respective dependent claims.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 10 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishiyama as applied to claims 1 and 14 above respectively, and further in view of Karighattam (6,594,776). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 10 and 22 are dependent on Claims 1 and 14, shown above to be allowable over Ishiyama. Thus, Claims 1 and 14 are also allowable over Ishiyama in view of Karighattam, as are Claims 10 and 22 for at least the same reasons.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1-25 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 8, 2006

By: 

David R. Metzger

Registration No.: 32,919

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000

14490201\V-1